

REMARKS

Applicant concurrently submits the above amendments and enclosed Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The specification is amended to add a cross-reference to a related co-pending application as discussed at the Examiner Interview. See below.

Claims 25-78 are pending in the application, with claims 25, 43, and 61 being the independent claims. Claims 1-24 are cancelled.

These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Hillery and Supervisory Patent Examiner Feild for their time and efforts on March 24, 2004 in discussing the cited references and proposed claim amendments. The preceding claim amendments are in furtherance to those discussions, where it was indicated that such amendments, subject to additional review by the Office, would likely be allowable.

With the entry of these amendments, applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-5 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,374,274 B1 issued to Myers et al. (hereinafter “Myers”). See Office Action at ¶ 10 and ¶ 14.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant respectfully submits that the newly entered claims are not anticipated by Myers, and specifically, that Myers does not teach, among other things, the selection of reviewers, who are provided access in a system of the claimed invention, to provide reviews of submissions to the system, which then determines which of the submissions to publish based on the scores or recommendations provided by reviewers, as claimed in independent claims 25, 43, and 61.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 25, 43, and 61 are patentable over Myers. Furthermore, the claims depending from the independent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons described above, and further in view of their own respective features. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner presents two obviousness rejections:

1. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Myers in view of US Patent No. 6,336,124 B1 issued to Alam et al. (hereinafter “Alam”). See Office Action at ¶ 11.

2. Claims 13-19, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Myers in view of Alam, and further in view of US Patent No. 5,706,542 A issued to Ivanov. See Office Action at ¶ 23.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Applicant respectfully submits that the above-stated distinctions with respect to Myers apply identically to the rejections combining Myers in view of Alam; and Myers and Alam in view of Ivanov. The independent claims (25, 43, and 61) have many similarities by which any rejection using Myers is overcome. Furthermore, neither Alam nor Ivanov provide the submission review processes presented in the independent claims. In light of the arguments put forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that the obviousness rejections are properly traversed.


For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 25-78 are patentable over the applied combinations. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


W. Russell Swindell
(Registration No. 50,906) 4/30/04

VENABLE LLP
Post Office Box 34385
Washington, DC 20043-9998
Telephone: (202) 344-4000
Direct dial: (202) 344-4053
Telefax : (202) 962-8300

DC2-DOCS1-543974